

12

AD A137566

NPRDC TR 84-13

JANUARY 1984

EVALUATION OF THREE PROGRAMS TO ASSIST
NAVY RECRUITERS

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED



DTIC
ELECTE

FEB 6 1984

B

NAVY PERSONNEL RESEARCH
AND
DEVELOPMENT CENTER
San Diego, California 92152

84 02 06 018



**EVALUATION OF THREE PROGRAMS TO ASSIST
NAVY RECRUITERS**

Walter C. Borman
Jody L. Toquam
Sharon R. Rose

Personnel Decisions Research Institute
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

Norman M. Abrahams
Navy Personnel Research and Development Center

Reviewed by
Martin F. Wiskoff

DTIC
ELECTE
S **D**
FEB 6 1984
B

Released by
J. W. Renard
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Navy Personnel Research and Development Center
San Diego, California 92152

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER NPRDC TR 84-13	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD- A137566	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) EVALUATION OF THREE PROGRAMS TO ASSIST NAVY RECRUITERS		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Report FY 1980
6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER 62-83-4		7. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00123-80D-1414
8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Personnel Decisions Research Institute Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402		9. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 62763N ZF63-521
10. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Navy Personnel Research and Development Center San Diego, California 92152		11. REPORT DATE January 1984
12. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 77
		14. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Recruiting Personnel accessioning Junior recruiters Recruiter assistants		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The Navy Recruiting Command (NRC) has developed and implemented three programs that use temporary "recruiter assistants" to aid recruiters in generating contacts and enlisting young persons in the Navy. This research evaluated the programs, identified possible ways to improve their effectiveness, and evaluated their cost effectiveness. A survey designed for these purposes was sent to all NRC district zone supervisors and		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 68 IS OBSOLETE
S/N 102-LF-014-6601

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

program coordinators (N = 250). Seventy-two percent responded. Survey results supported the following conclusions: (1) Recruiting assistance programs participants are generally effective in generating recruiting contacts; (2) participants have significant residual effectiveness in developing working relationships between recruiters and high school students and staff; and (3) research and evaluation for these programs would be improved by better monitoring of reports filed by recruiters. Survey respondents made useful suggestions, such as offering incentives, improving transportation, and providing better orientation to recruiting.

S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

FOREWORD

This research, sponsored by the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-135), was performed under program element 62763N (Personnel and Training Technology), subproject ZF63-521 (Recruiter Selection). The objective was to evaluate three programs that the Navy Recruiting Command (NRC) has developed to provide assistance to recruiters in generating contacts and enlisting young persons into the Navy. Although previous reports (NPRDC SRs 82-22, 83-11, and 83-38) provided useful information on these programs, user satisfaction and cost effectiveness have not been evaluated nationwide.

This research could not have been conducted without the competent support provided by NRC. Particular appreciation is expressed to LCDR Michael Reed (NRC-20) for his invaluable assistance throughout all phases of this project, as well as to all the participants who gave their time to complete interviews and surveys.

Results of this research are intended for NRC. The contracting officer's technical representative was Dr. Norman Abrahams.

J. W. RENARD
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

JAMES W. TWEEDDALE
Technical Director

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By PER CALL JC	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

SUMMARY

Problem

The Navy Recruiting Command (NRC) has developed and implemented three programs that use temporary "recruiter assistants" to aid recruiters in generating contacts and enlisting young persons in the Navy:

1. The recruiter assistance program (RAP) assigns recent basic training and "A" school graduates to aid in individual stations' recruiting efforts.
2. The hometown area recruiting program (HARP) brings fleet personnel onto temporary recruiting duty to assist with recruiting activities.
3. The senior minority assistance to recruiting (SEMINAR) program assigns officer and enlisted fleet personnel to district locations to publicize the Navy, especially in minority communities.

These programs have not been evaluated to determine user satisfaction or cost effectiveness nationwide.

Objectives

The objectives of this effort were to (1) evaluate each program by identifying perceived positive features and problem areas, (2) identify possible ways to improve the programs' effectiveness, and (3) evaluate the programs' cost effectiveness.

Approach

Structured interviews with recruiting personnel familiar with RAP, HARP, and SEMINAR, as well as performance reports on program participants, were used to develop questions for a survey designed to gather perceptions of the programs' strengths and weaknesses as well as suggestions for improvement. The survey was sent to all NRC zone supervisors and recruiter assistance coordinators (N = 250) and responses were analyzed. Cost-benefit analyses were performed to assess the programs' cost effectiveness.

Results

Completed surveys were returned by 181 (72%) of the zone supervisors and district program coordinators. Overall, zone supervisor and RAP coordinator respondents indicated that the programs were effective in helping the recruiting mission. RAP was judged somewhat more effective than HARP or SEMINAR. Also, respondents made a number of useful suggestions, such as offering incentives, improving transportation, and providing better orientation.

It costs an average of \$358 to make a new prospect contact through the usual recruiting channels, compared to an average of \$443 when assisted by RAP and \$159 when assisted by HARP. Cost effectiveness was not analyzed for SEMINAR.

The following specific issues were identified for RAP, HARP, and SEMINAR:

1. Participants assigned to the programs do not understand what is expected of them (especially with HARP).

2. Persons whom recruiters specifically request for RAP duty are sent to their fleet assignments rather than to RAP.

3. Incentives are lacking for RAP, HARP, and SEMINAR participant productivity.

4. Program participants lack transportation to assist the recruiting effort.

Conclusions

1. Recruiting assistance program participants are generally effective in generating recruiting contacts.

2. In addition to generating immediate contacts, participants have significant residual effectiveness in developing working relationships between recruiters and high school students and staff.

3. Research and evaluation for these programs would be improved by better monitoring of reports filed by recruiters.

Recommendations

The following recommendations respond to specific issues identified by the survey:

1. Incentives should be provided to participants for successful recruiting (e.g., time off, additional leave, or extension of duty).

2. Recruiters should receive better guidance in using participants effectively.

3. Regulations on driving government vehicles should be revised to allow access to them by recruiting assistance participants.

4. Potential participants for recruiting assistance duty should be given a realistic picture of the responsibilities they will be assigned.

5. Within limits imposed by the needs of the fleet, special efforts should be made to assign boot camp and "A" school graduates to RAP when recruiters specifically request them.

6. Fleet commanding officers or others responsible for HARP assignments should be better informed about what is expected of HARP participants.

The following recommendations respond to secondary issues that arose during the research:

1. Higher priority should be placed on getting recruiters to return completed participant reports.

2. Serious consideration should be given to using the recruiting assistance programs for early identification of personnel with potential for future assignment as regular recruiters.

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Background and Problem	1
Objectives	1
APPROACH	1
Survey Development	1
Cost-benefit Analyses	2
RESULTS	2
Survey Responses	2
RAP	2
HARP	3
SEMINAR	4
Cost-benefit Analyses	5
CONCLUSIONS	6
RECOMMENDATIONS	6
REFERENCES	9
APPENDIX A--RECRUITER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS SURVEY	A-0
APPENDIX B--SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO RECRUITER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS SURVEY	B-0
APPENDIX C--ASSUMPTIONS AND DATA USED IN COST-BENEFIT ANALYSES ...	C-0
DISTRIBUTION LIST	

INTRODUCTION

Background and Problem

The Navy Recruiting Command (NRC) has developed and implemented three programs that use temporary "recruiter assistants" to aid recruiters in generating contacts and enlisting young persons in the Navy:

1. From nominations of recruiters, the recruiter assistance program (RAP) assigns recent basic training and "A" school graduates to assist recruiters for 30 days at stations near the high schools attended by the RAP participants.
2. The hometown area recruiting program (HARP) sends enlisted personnel to their hometowns for 10 days of duty in recruiting stations assisting recruiters.
3. The senior minority assistance to recruiting (SEMINAR) program assigns officer and enlisted personnel to districts for 10 days to publicize the Navy, especially in minority communities.

The number of participants in the three programs varies from year to year because funding varies. In FY 1980, the period of this research, approximately 2,500 people participated in RAP, 10,850 in HARP, and 110 in SEMINAR. The programs have not been evaluated to determine user satisfaction or cost effectiveness nationwide.

Objectives

The objectives of the research reported here were to (1) evaluate each program by identifying positive features and problem areas, (2) identify possible ways to improve the programs' effectiveness, and (3) evaluate the programs' cost effectiveness.

APPROACH

Survey Development

To identify strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement in RAP, HARP, and SEMINAR, a survey was developed to gather user perceptions. Several sources of information were used to develop survey items.

1. Structured interviews were conducted in four recruiting districts. In each district, the program coordinator, the chief recruiter, the executive officer, the enlisted processing officer, and several experienced field recruiters were asked a series of questions about RAP, HARP, and SEMINAR. The discussions that took place during these interviews suggested questions to present to a larger survey respondent group.
2. The national coordinators of RAP, HARP, and SEMINAR were interviewed to obtain evaluations of the programs' effectiveness and suggestions for methods of increasing it. Information gathered in these interviews also helped generate survey items.
3. Comments from the reports on participant performance sent to the national coordinators from recruiters supervising HARP and SEMINAR were reviewed.¹

¹RAP also requires reports from recruiter supervisors, but the comments from these reports were not available for this research.

The information gathered from the interviews and written reports was incorporated into the survey questions (see Appendix A). These covered a range of program indices ranging from mission effectiveness to cost. The respondents' opinions and suggestions about the three programs were anonymous. Recruiter assistance coordinators and zone supervisors (N = 250) in all Navy recruiting districts were sent the survey and asked to return it by mail.

Cost-benefit Analyses

To evaluate the program's cost-effectiveness, financial data were obtained from NRC. The costs analyzed included RAP airfare and per diem estimates, average salary and benefits for participants during their RAP or HARP duty, and average salary and benefits for district program coordinators and recruiter supervisors.

Reports on RAP and HARP participants contain estimates of the number of new prospect contacts attributable to their efforts. Over a 6-month period, August 1979 to February 1980, RAP reports were on file for 269 (22%) of the approximately 1,250 RAP participants during that period (2,500 participated in RAP during the year). HARP reports were available for 310 (approximately 6%) of the 5,425 HARP participants during that period. Although these reports may have described performance that was, on the average, different from the performance of participants for whom no reports were on file, they were used to compute mean new prospect contact scores for RAP and HARP.

RESULTS

Survey Responses

Completed surveys were returned by 181 (72%) of the zone supervisors and district program coordinators. A summary analysis of the survey item responses has been included in Appendix B. The following discussion presents results drawn from that analysis.

RAP

Positive Features. Concerning the overall success of RAP in meeting its mission (see Section 7, Item 6, Appendix A), 1 percent of the responses were "extremely successful," 20 percent were "very successful," 63 percent were "somewhat successful," and 16 percent were "unsuccessful for the most part." No one checked "completely successful." Fully 78 percent of the survey sample felt that RAP personnel were a definite asset to the recruiting stations (Item 3-3).

Regarding specific factors that contribute to program success, the overwhelming majority (95%) felt that RAP participants were enthusiastic and "fired up" about the Navy when they reported for duty, attitudes that helped in their recruiting efforts (Item 7-1). They were considered especially useful in introducing recruiters to the high school students and teachers they knew (87% and 57% respectively of the responses were "very useful" for these roles; Items 4-1 and 2). In addition, at least 80 percent of the survey respondents believed that RAP participants were either "very" or "somewhat useful" in giving talks about the Navy, seeking prospects in the community, gathering places for youths, and helping recruiters with interviews and home visits (Items 4-3, 4, and 7).

Negative Features. The greatest perceived difficulties with RAP were that (1) persons assigned to RAP do not understand the program or their role in it (79% of

respondents saw this issue as a "major problem" or as "somewhat of a problem," the first two categories of response; Item 2-11), (2) RAP does not provide enough incentive for success (69% of responses were in the first two categories, Item 2-2), (3) program participants don't have transportation (67% in the first two categories, Item 2-1), (4) persons the recruiter specifically requests for RAP duty are sent instead to their fleet assignments (64% in the first two categories, Item 2-3). In fact, only 19 percent of respondents indicated "a lot" or "considerable" to describe their control in getting RAP participants they wanted (see Item 7-2).

Improving the Program. The majority (94%) of respondents believed that activities and program objectives should be specifically planned for each participant by the recruiter (Item 3-1). The majority (88%) also felt that an incentive program to participants for bringing in prospects or accessions would either "greatly" or "somewhat" improve the RAP program (Item 1-2). More than 50 percent of respondents answered "would greatly" or "would somewhat" improve the RAP program to suggestions concerning bonus pay for successful recruiting (Item 1-3), guidance for recruiters in using RAP (Item 1-5), and transportation for participants to and from the recruiting stations (Item 1-1).

HARP

Positive Features. HARP was judged less effective than RAP in meeting Navy recruiting objectives. Concerning the overall success of HARP in meeting its mission (Item 8-3), 1 percent of the responses were "extremely successful," 5 percent were "very successful," 49 percent were "somewhat successful," 39 percent were "unsuccessful for the most part," and 7 percent were "completely unsuccessful." Only 39 percent of survey respondents (see Appendix B for detailed analysis of HARP item responses) believed that HARP participants were definite assets to the recruiting stations (Item 3-3).

As with RAP, survey respondents rated the usefulness of participants in specific roles. Most respondents saw participants as useful in helping recruiters with interviews and home visits (86% of responses were "very" or "somewhat useful," Item 4-7). Most responses indicated that HARP participants were at least "somewhat useful" at providing contacts with high school students and teachers (71%, Item 4-1) and at giving talks about the Navy to high school and other groups (78%, Item 4-3).

Negative Features. Respondents perceived many of the same difficulties with HARP as with RAP: (1) persons volunteering for the program do not understand its mission or their role in it (Item 2-11, 88% of responses were "a major problem" or "somewhat of a problem"), (2) program participants are not qualified; for example, their personalities are too introverted (Item 2-9, 78% "major problem" or "somewhat of a problem"), (3) the program does not provide sufficient incentive for successful recruiting (68%, Item 2-2), and (4) program participants lack transportation (61%, Item 2-1). The majority of respondents (78%) believed that most persons volunteer for HARP duty to get additional vacation time near home (Item 8-1).

Improving the Program. Almost every respondent (96%) indicated one of the two highest categories, "would greatly improve" or "would somewhat improve the program," to a suggestion to increase awareness of HARP among commanding officers in the fleet, thereby increasing their ability to recommend productive participants (Item 1-8). In addition, most responses fell into one of those two categories for suggestions about giving HARP participants bonus pay (81%, Item 1-3) and offering promotions (79%, Item 1-2) for effective HARP performance in recruiting. At least 60 percent of responses indicated the first two categories for other ways to improve HARP: (1) Give recruiters guidance in the

best use of HARP participants (80%, Item 1-5), (2) provide recruiters with more information on HARP volunteers before they arrive for duty (77%, Item 1-9), (3) provide volunteers with transportation to and from the recruiting stations (68%, Item 1-1), and (4) increase the length of HARP duty (66%, Item 1-10). Finally, 87 percent of the respondents agreed that HARP assignment guidelines should be more strictly enforced to reduce the number of inappropriate assignments (Item 8-2).

SEMINAR

Positive Features. Like HARP, SEMINAR² was judged less effective than RAP in meeting its mission (Item 9-3), although 60 percent of the survey respondents believe the program is at least somewhat successful ("extremely successful," 1%; "very successful," 6%; "somewhat successful," 53%; see Appendix B for detailed analysis of SEMINAR item responses). SEMINAR was marked "unsuccessful for the most part" by 25 percent, and "completely unsuccessful" by 16 percent of respondents. Regarding its primary objective, 5 percent answered that SEMINAR participants have been very successful in raising minority group awareness of the Navy (Item 9-1), 57 percent marked "somewhat successful," and 38 percent marked "not successful."

Survey respondents indicated that giving talks about the Navy was the most useful role for participants (Item 4-3; 48% answered "very useful" and 35%, "somewhat useful"). Also, 75 percent marked as "very useful" or "somewhat useful" the SEMINAR participants' role supporting recruiters during interviews and home visits (Item 4-7).

Negative Features. The most serious problem with SEMINAR, as seen by survey respondents, was that participants do not understand the program or their role in it (Item 2-11; 64% of responses were either "a major problem" or "somewhat of a problem"). More than 50 percent of respondents indicated that SEMINAR does not provide sufficient incentive or reward for successful participants (Item 2-2; 24% of responses were "a major problem," 31% were "somewhat of a problem").

Improving the Program. Several of the improvements identified for RAP and HARP emerged as suggestions to improve the SEMINAR program. The three most often cited were to (1) provide recruiters with more guidance in using participants effectively (Item 1-5; 50% of responses indicated "would greatly," 30% "would somewhat improve" SEMINAR), (2) reward successful participants by giving bonus pay (Item 1-3; 50% "would greatly," 22% "would somewhat improve the program"), and (3) provide recruiters with more information about participants' background and skills before they come on SEMINAR duty (Item 1-9, 46% "would greatly," 26% "would somewhat improve the program").

²Interpretation of all SEMINAR survey findings must be made with caution. Only 12² of the 181 respondents answered questions about SEMINAR, producing percentages for SEMINAR based on substantially fewer responses than for RAP or HARP. Furthermore, many SEMINAR respondents stated that they knew little about the program or that their responses were based on what they had heard about it. Because the program is very small (110 participants during the year studied), many of the survey respondents had never worked with a SEMINAR participant.

Cost-benefit Analyses

Cost-benefit analyses were performed on the RAP and HARP programs separately.³ Although the analyses were rather crude because of the nature of the data, results do provide a rough cost per prospective recruit generated by the programs.

The participant reports completed by recruiter supervisors showed that each RAP participant generated an average of 5.74 contacts (prospects) per 30-day duty period. NRC reported that the average travel expense in 1980 for each RAP participant included \$225 in air fare and \$690 in per diem (\$23 per day for 30 days), in addition to the average salary and benefits cost of approximately \$1,326. Survey respondents estimated that a participant's recruiter sponsor spends an average of 46 minutes per day dealing with the participant in activities not directly related to recruiting (e.g., transportation and paperwork), which amounts to a cost of \$216 for salary and benefits. Finally, district program coordinators spend approximately one-quarter of their time administering the RAP program, or \$84 per RAP participant (see Appendix C for assumptions and procedures used in developing these estimates). Thus, when the estimated total cost per participant, \$2,541, is divided by 5.74, the mean number of new contacts per RAP participant, results show that each RAP-assisted contact costs \$443.

Participant reports attributed a mean number of 4.12 contacts to HARP participants per 10-day stay. HARP participants bear their own travel costs. However, their salary and benefits cost for the 10 days was estimated at \$570 each. Salary and benefit costs for recruiter time (averaging 43 minutes per day) to work with HARP participant activities not directly related to recruiting were \$67 and those for the district program coordinator for approximately one-quarter time spent on HARP were \$19 (see Appendix C). Accordingly, the average total cost per HARP participant is \$656, producing an estimated cost per HARP-assisted contact of \$159.

As mentioned previously, these analyses were necessarily crude because of problems with the data sources. There were two specific concerns: (1) the low return rates for RAP (6%) and HARP (22%) participant reports, which may have distorted estimates of the new contacts attributable to RAP and HARP participants, and (2) the inherent difficulty in deciding whether a new contact should be attributed to program participant efforts (different recruiters probably assign new contacts in different ways, creating another potential source of error in new contact estimates).

Furthermore, the cost-benefit analyses do not provide the whole story. Cost-benefit results must also be tempered by adequate consideration of potential benefits in addition to raw numbers of contacts generated. For example, a large percentage of survey respondents saw benefits realized from participants' helping with interviews and home visits, giving talks about the Navy, and introducing recruiters to teachers and other high school officials. Another intangible benefit concerns the observation that recruiter assistance programs may be useful as "assessment centers" for the early identification of personnel with superior potential for future assignment as regular recruiters. These positive features are not accounted for in the cost-benefit analyses.

³Performing a cost-benefit of SEMINAR was more difficult because a primary objective of the program is for participants to present a good Navy image in minority communities. Since there seemed no way to measure SEMINAR participants' effectiveness in this aspect of the program, no cost-benefit analysis was conducted on SEMINAR.

Nonetheless, a rough comparison can be made between the costs for new contacts generated by production recruiters and by RAP and HARP participants. NRC estimated that it spent \$156,725,209 for recruiting 99,351 accessions in 1980, and that it required five new contacts with military-eligible youths to obtain one accession. Therefore, there was a total of 496,755 prospects. Of these, 437,703 (88%) were attributable to recruiter efforts; and 59,052 (12%) to RAP or HARP efforts. Thus, each recruiter-generated new contact or prospect cost \$358 (see Appendix C for assumptions and computations), compared to \$443 each for RAP-assisted contacts and \$159 for HARP-assisted contacts.

CONCLUSIONS

Because of the small number of responses to questions about SEMINAR, only RAP and HARP are discussed in this section.

Although RAP has its problems, district-level management in general believed that it was effective in support of Navy recruiting, especially in providing recruiters with high school student and teacher contacts (teacher contacts were not considered in the cost-benefit analyses). Furthermore, the dollar investment in RAP seemed justified according to the rough cost-benefit analysis described previously (provided that the intangible effects are considered).

Interviews and survey results suggested that the main problems with RAP were:

1. Participants recommended by recruiters often are not assigned to RAP duty.
2. Many RAP participants fail to understand the purpose of the program and their role in it.
3. Participants receive insufficient rewards for successful recruiting.
4. Participants often do not have transportation to the recruiting stations.

The main problem with HARP is that fleet commanding officers and HARP volunteers often do not understand that participants should have aptitude for recruiting and that they are expected to work hard during their 10 days on recruiting duty. Consequently, HARP participants often are not well suited for recruiting or are not enthusiastic about doing a good job. Furthermore, because HARP participants have not been in school as recently as RAP participants, they typically lack the high school contacts of RAP. Despite these criticisms and the generally less positive reaction to the HARP program on the part of zone supervisor and RAP coordinator survey respondents, HARP appeared to be a reasonably successful program. According to recruiter report estimates (Appendix C), HARP participants were responsible for approximately twice as many new contacts per day as were RAP participants. Also, the cost-benefit data suggested that the program was cost effective.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations respond to specific issues identified by the survey:

1. Incentives should be provided to participants for successful recruiting (e.g., time off, additional leave, or extension of duty).

2. Recruiters should receive better guidance in using participants effectively.
3. Regulations on driving government vehicles should be revised to allow access to them by recruiting assistance participants.
4. Potential participants for recruiting assistance duty should be given a realistic picture of the responsibilities they will be assigned.
5. Within limits imposed by the needs of the fleet, special efforts should be made to assign boot camp and "A" school graduates to RAP when recruiters specifically request them.
6. Fleet commanding officers or others responsible for HARP assignments should be better informed about what is expected of HARP participants.

The following recommendations respond to secondary issues that arose during the research:

1. Higher priority should be placed on getting recruiters to return completed participant reports.
2. Serious consideration should be given to using the recruiting assistance programs for early identification of personnel with potential for future assignment as regular recruiters.

REFERENCES

Fernandes, K. Evaluation of the Navy's recruiting assistance program as a peer networking strategy for recruiting the 19- to 23-year-old market (NPRDC Spec. Rep. 83-11). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, January 1983.

Fernandes, K., Romanczuk, A. P., Goodstadt, B. E., & Colby, C. L. Evaluation of a tailored direct-mail marketing strategy for recruiting the 19- to 23-year-old market (NPRDC Spec. Rep. 83-38). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, May 1983. (AD-A129 860)

Romanczuk, A. P., Goodstadt, B. E., Colby, C. L., & Fernandes, K. Identification of strategies for penetrating the 19- to 23-year-old market (NPRDC Spec. Rep. 82-22). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, April 1982. (AD-A114 261)

APPENDIX A
RECRUITER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS SURVEY

RECRUITER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS SURVEY

Introduction

This survey asks for your opinions about the recruiter assistance programs: RAP, HARP, and SEMINAR. We are very interested in getting your ideas about these programs, how they have worked in the past and how they might be improved in the future to meet continuing Navy recruiting challenges. As a RAP Coordinator or Zone Supervisor, you know a lot about the programs' operations in your NRD/Zone, and therefore we very much value your input on this.

The survey is brief (30-45 minutes). Please complete it as soon as possible, within one week, and return it to PDRI in the stamped envelope. No one from the Recruiting Command will be shown your answers. Instead, PDRI will present summaries of the results to Recruiting Command officials.

Survey Instructions

Many of the questions in this survey ask you to consider each of the three recruiter assistance programs separately (i.e., RAP, HARP, and SEMINAR). An example of how you should do this appears below. Please read through the example before starting to answer the survey questions.

Example:

Below are a number of statements describing difficulties that some recruiters have had with the recruiter assistance programs. To what extent have you found these to be a problem? Use the following scale:

- A. This is a major problem
- B. This is somewhat of a problem
- C. This is only a minor problem
- D. This is not a problem

Answer A-D for
each program

<u>RAP</u>	<u>HARP</u>	<u>SEMINAR</u>
<u>B</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>
<u>B</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>B</u>
<u>A</u>		

1. Program participants do not have a ride to and from the station or recruiting site.
2. Programs do not provide sufficient incentives or rewards for participants successful in recruiting.
3. Persons nominated for the program are sent to their fleet assignment rather than returned to the recruiting station after completing boot camp or A school.

Regarding Question #1 in the example, the respondent felt that this is somewhat of a problem for the RAP and HARP programs, but only a minor problem for SEMINAR. In reaction to the second question, the respondent felt this was somewhat of a problem with all three programs. And finally, Question #3 is applicable only to the RAP program, and the respondent considered this a major problem with RAP.

Remember then to consider each program separately when asked to do so. Please go ahead now and complete the survey.

Section 1

Survey Questions

Listed below are a number of suggestions for improving the recruiter assistance programs, RAP, HARP, and SEMINAR. To what extent do you feel that these ideas, if implemented, would improve the program? Please use the following scale:

- A. Would greatly improve the program
- B. Would somewhat improve the program
- C. Would not improve the program at all

Answer A-C for each
program

<u>RAP</u>	<u>HARP</u>	<u>SEMINAR</u>
------------	-------------	----------------

_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------

1. Special provisions that allow for the program participant to have transportation to and from the recruiting station.

_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------

2. An incentive program similar to that used with DEP, offering higher pay grades (i.e., promotions) to personnel bringing in accessions.

_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------

3. Bonus pay (not higher pay grades) to reward program participants bringing in accessions.

_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------

4. Change RAP check-in point from district headquarters to the assigned recruiting station.

_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------

5. Issue recruiters an instructional manual or other guide on how to supervise and utilize program participants.

_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------

6. Schedule participants so that more are sent during summer when high school students are out of school.

_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------

7. Schedule participants so fewer are sent during summer or vacation breaks.

_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------

8. Increase awareness of recruiter assistance programs among COs in the fleet so that they will be better able to recommend participants.

RAP HARP SEMINAR

9. Provide recruiters with more information on the participant's background, skills, and abilities before he/she arrives at the station.

10. Increase the length of duty for participants.

11. Decrease the length of duty for participants.

12. How else might these programs be improved?

RAP: _____

HARP: _____

SEMINAR: _____

Section 2

Below are several statements describing difficulties that some recruiters have encountered with the recruiter assistance programs. To what extent have you found these to be a problem? Use the following scale:

- A. This is a major problem
- B. This is somewhat of a problem
- C. This is only a minor problem
- D. This is not a problem

Answer A- D for each
program

RAP HARP SEMINAR

1. Program participants do not have a ride to and from the station or recruiting sites.

2. Programs do not provide sufficient incentives or rewards for participants who are successful in recruiting.

3. Persons nominated for the program are sent to their fleet assignment rather than returned to the recruiting station after completing boot camp or A school.

4. Stations do not receive enough program participants in certain ratings.

5. Stations receive program participants they had not requested.

6. Stations do not have enough forewarning to prepare for a participant's arrival.

7. Program participants are sent to districts where they are not needed (e.g., no minority community).

8. Participants are sent at a time when the station cannot use them effectively (e.g., when the station is heavily involved in other activities).

9. Program participants are not qualified for the duty (e.g., introvert).

- ____ 10. Participants are sent to areas where they
_____ did not actually attend high school.
- ____ 11. Persons volunteering for the program do
_____ not understand the program mission or
_____ their role in it.
12. Other problems with the programs:

RAP: _____

HARP: _____

SEMINAR: _____

Section 3

Following are a number of questions regarding the role of the recruiter and participants in the success of the RAP, HARP, and SEMINAR programs. Mark (✓) the one answer for each program that reflects most closely your own opinion.

1. The program is most effective when:

One check (✓) for each program

RAP HARP SEMINAR

a. The recruiter provides the participant with a specific set of activities and objectives.

b. The recruiter provides the participant with only general guidelines on what to do (specific directions are not needed).

c. The recruiter does not provide a pre-planned set of activities for the participant, but has the participant assist on activities as needed.

d. The recruiter allows the participant to work on whatever activities he/she feels best able to handle.

2. How much direct supervision do program participants require?

One check (✓) for each program

RAP HARP SEMINAR

a. A great deal; a recruiter should oversee all activities during the participant's tour of duty.

b. Moderate supervision; a recruiter should oversee all major activities performed by the participant.

c. Very little supervision; a recruiter should be aware of participant's activities but does not need to oversee them directly.

3. Which statements best describes the attitude of recruiters in your district toward RAP, HARP, and SEMINAR?

One check (✓) for each program

RAP HARP SEMINAR

____ ____ ____

a. Participants are an extra burden on the station.

____ ____ ____

b. Participants have little or no effect on the productivity of the station.

____ ____ ____

c. Participants are a definite asset to the station.

4. How important are the participant's hometown contacts to success of the program--i.e., to bringing in prospects and accessions?

One check (✓) for each program

RAP HARP SEMINAR

____ ____ ____

a. Unimportant; a motivated participant can relate to community members even if he/she has no contacts in the area.

____ ____ ____

b. Slightly important.

____ ____ ____

c. Quite important.

____ ____ ____

d. Very important; without contacts in the community the participant cannot effectively assist in the recruiting effort.

5. If a participant was not successful in bringing in qualified prospects or accessions, the most likely reason would be that the participant:

One check (✓) for each program

RAP HARP SEMINAR

a. Was not suited for the task (e.g., too shy to do prospecting).

b. Had lost touch with contacts in the area.

c. Was given little direction by the recruiter on what to do.

d. Did not have the opportunity to contact potential prospects (e.g., worked only in office, had no transportation, etc.).

e. Was not really interested in the program.

Other reasons? _____

6. In your opinion the most important role of the participant is to:

One check (✓) for each program

RAP HARP SEMINAR

a. Introduce recruiters to contacts, centers of influence, etc. in the participant's hometown.

b. Provide for community youth a model of the young men and women in the Navy.

c. Act as an assistant to the recruiter and help out in the station wherever he/she is needed.

d. Bring in (on own) accessions or high quality prospects.

Other roles? _____

Section 4

In your experience with the RAP, HARP, and SEMINAR programs, how useful are participants in each one of these roles. Use the following scale:

- A. Very useful
- B. Somewhat useful
- C. Not at all useful

Answer A-C for each
program

<u>RAP</u>	<u>HARP</u>	<u>SEMINAR</u>
------------	-------------	----------------

_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------

1. As a contact with high school students he/she knows.

_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------

2. Introducing recruiters to teachers at high school.

_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------

3. Giving talks about the Navy to high school or other groups.

_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------

4. Seeking prospects in community and at shopping malls, youth centers, unemployment offices, etc.

_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------

5. Assisting with phone prospecting.

_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------

6. Helping with office duties such as preparing mail-outs, updating card systems, and manning office in recruiter's absence.

_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------

7. Participating with recruiter in interviews and home visits.

Other roles in which they are useful? _____

Section 5

To what extent do you agree with the following statements? Use this scale:

- A. Definitely agree
- B. Slightly agree
- C. Neither agree or disagree
- D. Slightly disagree
- E. Definitely disagree

Answer A-E for each
program

RAP HARP SEMINAR

1. The programs require recruiters to take a great deal of time out of their regular duties to train and supervise participants.
2. Generally speaking, program participants have no impact on the morale of the station.
3. Program participants do not increase the station's recruiting effectiveness.
4. Participants directly help the station reach its goal by bringing in good prospects and creating accessions.
5. Participants help the station indirectly by setting up centers of influence which later lead to prospects and accessions.

Section 6

Following are two questions about the recruiter assistance programs in general. Mark (✓) one answer that reflects most closely your own opinion.

1. Forgetting for a moment the rules regarding selection for RAP, HARP, and SEMINAR, what is the best time in a person's Navy career to participate in recruiter assistance programs?
 - ☐ a. Immediately after boot camp
 - ☐ b. Immediately after A school
 - ☐ c. One-two years after joining the Navy
 - ☐ d. Three-five years after joining the Navy
 - ☐ e. More than five years after joining the Navy
2. How useful are the recruiter assistance programs for identifying persons with potential to be good recruiters in the future?
 - ☐ a. Very useful
 - ☐ b. Somewhat useful
 - ☐ c. Slightly useful
 - ☐ d. Not useful

Section 7

The following questions apply to only one of the programs.

Regarding RAP:

1. The three statements below describe possible attitudes or outlooks RAP participants might have. Circle T if you believe the statement is true in most cases, or circle F if you believe the statement is false in most cases.
 - T F They tend to be too immature to handle the assignment and to assist the recruiting effort.
 - T F Having just finished boot camp or A school, RAPs tend to be fired-up about the Navy.
 - T F RAPs coming right out of boot camp tend to be down on the experience and express a bad attitude toward the Navy.

For Questions 2-6 below, mark (✓) the one answer that reflects most closely your own opinion about RAP.

2. How much control do you have in getting the RAP participants you want?

- ☐ a. A lot
- ☐ b. Considerable
- ☐ c. Some, but should be more
- ☐ d. Very little
- ☐ e. None

3. Some persons familiar with RAP have suggested that Company Commanders at RTC should nominate for RAP duty boot camp graduates who appear especially fired-up about the Navy and are likely to make a good impression on prospects. What do you think of this idea?

- ☐ a. Very good idea; should be put into operation
- ☐ b. Good idea; it's worth a try
- ☐ c. Not a good idea; Company Commanders don't know enough about the contacts a boot camp graduate may or may not have in his/her community.

4. How often are recruiting stations given enough time to prepare for a RAP participant before his/her arrival?

- ☐ a. Always
- ☐ b. Usually
- ☐ c. Sometimes
- ☐ d. Rarely
- ☐ e. Never

5. Which statement best describes your feelings about how RAP participants are selected for duty? The process is:

- ☐ a. Very effective; RAP participants are always well qualified to serve in the program
- ☐ b. Somewhat effective; many participants chosen are qualified and capable
- ☐ c. Somewhat ineffective; many persons who are selected cannot handle the duties
- ☐ d. Very ineffective; anyone who really wants to participate in the program is accepted even if they are not well qualified

6. Overall, how successful is the RAP program in meeting its mission?

- ☐ a. Extremely successful
- ☐ b. Very successful
- ☐ c. Somewhat successful
- ☐ d. Unsuccessful for the most part
- ☐ e. Completely successful

7. What aspects of the program have been most important for its success?

8. What aspects of the program have been most important for reducing its effectiveness?

Section 8

Regarding HARP:

1. In your opinion why do most people volunteer for HARP?
 - ☐ a. To get a vacation near home
 - ☐ b. To see what recruiting has to offer (as a possible future assignment)
 - ☐ c. To help in the recruiting effort
 - ☐ d. To get away from their fleet job for awhile
 - Other reasons? _____
2. What do you think of this suggestion? HARP requirements should be more strictly followed in assigning personnel to HARP duty (e.g., relatively young, HS graduate, etc.).
 - ☐ a. Agree
 - ☐ b. Disagree (If so, why?) _____
3. Overall, how successful is the HARP program in meeting its mission?
 - ☐ a. Extremely successful
 - ☐ b. Very successful
 - ☐ c. Somewhat successful
 - ☐ d. Unsuccessful for the most part
 - ☐ e. Completely unsuccessful
4. What aspects of the program have been most important for its success?

5. What aspects of the program have been most important for reducing its effectiveness?

Section 9

Regarding SEMINAR:

1. In your experience, to what extent have SEMINAR participants been successful in raising minority community awareness of the Navy?
 - ☐ a. Very successful
 - ☐ b. Somewhat successful
 - ☐ c. Not successful
2. What do you see as the most effective role for SEMINAR participants?
 - ☐ a. Prospecting for minority recruits
 - ☐ b. Working directly with minority persons already identified as prospects
 - ☐ c. Giving presentations about the Navy in person and on TV/radio
3. Overall, how successful is the SEMINAR program in meeting its mission?
 - ☐ a. Extremely successful
 - ☐ b. Very successful
 - ☐ c. Somewhat successful
 - ☐ d. Unsuccessful for the most part
 - ☐ e. Completely unsuccessful
4. What aspects of the program have been most important for its success?

5. What aspects of the program have been most important for reducing its effectiveness?

Section 10

Now, five final questions about administration of these programs:

1. On the average, how many minutes per day does a recruiter, responsible for a program participant, spend with that person in activities not directly related to recruiting (e.g., arranging for or providing transportation, explaining duties, processing paperwork on the participant, etc.)?

RAP participant _____ minutes
HARP participant _____ minutes
SEMINAR participant _____ minutes

2. How many program participants did you have in your NRD 1 January 1980 - 1 January 1981?

_____ RAP
_____ HARP
_____ SEMINAR

3. In your NRD, how many prospects is the typical program participant primarily responsible for generating during a single, regulation-length stay?

_____ RAP (30 days)
_____ HARP (10 days)
_____ SEMINAR (10 days)

4. How many accessions is the typical program participant primarily responsible for during a single, regulation-length stay?

_____ RAP (30 days)
_____ HARP (10 days)
_____ SEMINAR (10 days)

-
- This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

A-18

APPENDIX B
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO RECRUITER ASSISTANCE
PROGRAMS SURVEY

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES
TO RECRUITING ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS SURVEY

Objective Questions (N=181)

SECTION 1 - SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE PROGRAM

- A. Would greatly improve the program
B. Would somewhat improve the program
C. Would not improve the program at all

	Percent Responding								
	<u>RAP</u>			<u>HARP</u>			<u>SEMINAR</u>		
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>
1. Special provisions that allow for the program participant to have transportation to and from the recruiting station.	39	35	26	29	39	33	21	33	46
2. An incentive program similar to that used with DEP, offering higher pay grades (i.e., promotions) to personnel bringing in accessions.	66	22	12	50	29	22	30	26	44
3. Bonus pay (not higher pay grades) to reward program participants bringing in accessions.	57	23	20	58	23	19	50	22	28
4. Change RAP check-in point from district headquarters to the assigned recruiting station.	33	22	46	30	18	52	34	19	47
5. Issue recruiters an instructional manual or other guide on how to supervise and utilize program participants.	44	37	19	45	35	20	50	30	21
6. Schedule participants so that more are sent during summer when high school students are out of school.	11	21	68	12	22	66	6	17	77
7. Schedule participants so fewer are sent during summer or vacation breaks.	40	26	34	31	27	42	30	22	48
8. Increase awareness of recruiter assistance programs among COs in the fleet so that they will be better able to recommend participants.				84	12	4			

Percent Responding									
	<u>RAP</u>			<u>HARP</u>			<u>SEMINAR</u>		
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>
9. Provide recruiters with more information on the participant's background, skills, and abilities before he/she arrives at the station.	32	35	33	41	36	23	46	26	28
10. Increase the length of duty for participants.	30	23	46	40	26	34	19	26	55
11. Decrease the length of duty for participants.	4	8	88	3	2	95	7	3	89

SECTION 2 - PROBLEMS WITH RAP AND HARP

- A. This is a major problem
- B. This is somewhat of a problem
- C. This is only a minor problem
- D. This is not a problem

Percent Responding												
	<u>RAP</u>				<u>HARP</u>				<u>SEMINAR</u>			
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>
1. Program participants do not have a ride to and from the station or recruiting sites.	33	34	23	9	27	34	26	12	9	19	36	36
2. Programs do not provide sufficient incentives or rewards for participants who are successful in recruiting.	35	34	18	13	35	33	17	16	24	31	22	24
3. Persons nominated for the program are sent to their fleet assignment rather than returned to the recruiting station after completing boot camp or A school.	37	27	16	20								

					Percent Responding											
					RAP				HARP				SEMINAR			
					A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
4.	Stations do not receive enough program participants in certain ratings.	8	12	40	41	7	10	40	43	7	4	37	52			
5.	Stations receive program participants they had <u>not</u> requested.	31	24	24	22											
6.	Stations do not have enough forewarning to prepare for a participant's arrival.	23	27	29	22	27	24	28	21	20	21	25	35			
7.	Program participants are sent to districts where they are not needed (e.g., no minority community).	4	7	30	59	4	8	29	58	7	8	29	57			
8.	Participants are sent at a time when the station cannot use them effectively (e.g., when the station is heavily involved in other activities).	10	18	37	36	10	21	36	33	8	17	31	44			
9.	Program participants are not qualified for the duty (e.g., introvert).	29	32	28	12	43	35	17	5	23	26	26	25			
10.	Participants are sent to areas where they did not actually attend high school.	18	31	27	23	24	31	29	16	17	19	24	41			
11.	Persons volunteering for the program do not understand the program mission or their role in it.	50	29	13	9	65	23	9	3	40	24	19	18			

SECTION 3 - ROLE OF THE RECRUITER AND PARTICIPANTS IN RAP AND HARP

1. The program is most effective when:

	Percent Responding		
	<u>RAP</u>	<u>HARP</u>	<u>SEMINAR</u>
a. The recruiter provides the participant with a specific set of activities and objectives.	94	81	69
b. The recruiter provides the participant with only general guidelines on what to do (specific directions are not needed).	3	7	25
c. The recruiter does not provide a preplanned set of activities for the participant, but has the participant assist on activities as needed.	3	10	4
d. The recruiter allows the participant to work on whatever activities he/she feels best able to handle.	1	3	2

2. How much direct supervision do program participants require?

	Percent Responding		
	<u>RAP</u>	<u>HARP</u>	<u>SEMINAR</u>
a. A great deal; a recruiter should oversee all activities during the participant's tour of duty.	64	49	22
b. Moderate supervision; a recruiter should oversee all major activities performed by the participant.	34	46	41
c. Very little supervision; a recruiter should be aware of participant's activities but does not need to oversee them directly.	2	5	37

3. Which statements best describe the attitude of recruiters
in your district toward RAP and HARP?

	Percent Responding		
	<u>RAP</u>	<u>HARP</u>	<u>SEMINAR</u>
a. Participants are an extra burden on the station.	3	16	13
b. Participants have little or no effect on the productivity of the station.	19	45	51
c. Participants are a definite asset to the station.	78	39	36

4. How important are the participant's hometown contacts
to success of the program--i.e., to bringing in prospects and accessions?

	Percent Responding		
	<u>RAP</u>	<u>HARP</u>	<u>SEMINAR</u>
a. Unimportant; a motivated participant can relate to community members even if he/she has no contacts in the area.	15	10	24
b. Slightly important.	9	16	17
c. Quite important.	20	28	20
d. Very important; without contacts in the community, the participant cannot effectively assist in the recruiting effort.	56	46	39

5. If a participant was not successful in bringing in qualified prospects or accessions, the most likely reason would be that the participant:

	Percent Responding		
	<u>RAP</u>	<u>HARP</u>	<u>SEMINAR</u>
a. Was not suited for the task (e.g., too shy to do prospecting).	40	17	18
b. Had lost touch with contacts in the area.	5	28	37
c. Was given little direction by the recruiter on what to do.	40	18	15
d. Did not have the opportunity to contact potential prospects (e.g., worked only in office, had no transportation, etc.).	10	7	5
e. Was not really interested in the program.	7	31	25

6. In your opinion the most important role of the participant is to:

	Percent Responding		
	<u>RAP</u>	<u>HARP</u>	<u>SEMINAR</u>
a. Introduce recruiters to contacts, centers of influence, etc. in the participant's hometown.	28	28	60
b. Provide for community youth a model of the young men and women in the Navy.	17	20	9
c. Act as an assistant to the recruiter and help out in the station wherever he/she is needed.	6	10	6
d. Bring in (on own) accessions or high quality prospects.	49	42	25

SECTION 4 - USEFULNESS OF PARTICIPANTS IN VARIOUS JOBS

- A. Very useful
- B. Somewhat useful
- C. Not at all useful

	Percent Responding								
	RAP			HARP			SEMINAR		
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>
1. As a contact with high school students he/she knows.	87	12		25	46	29	14	20	66
2. Introducing recruiters to teachers at high school.	57	32	12	18	53	29	11	36	53
3. Giving talks about the Navy to high school.	33	48	20	30	48	22	48	35	17
4. Seeking prospects in community and at shopping malls, youth center, unemployment offices, etc.	35	51	14	27	60	13	16	50	34
5. Assisting with phone prospecting.	26	46	28	15	51	34	10	40	51
6. Helping with office duties such as preparing mail-outs, updating card systems, and manning office in recruiter's absence.	17	44	39	20	44	36	13	33	54
7. Participating with recruiter in interviews and home visits.	51	40	9	37	49	15	38	37	24

SECTION 5 - MORE SURVEY QUESTIONS

- A. Definitely agree
- B. Slightly agree
- C. Neither agree or disagree
- D. Slightly disagree
- E. Definitely disagree

	Percent Responding														
	<u>RAP</u>					<u>HARP</u>					<u>SEMINAR</u>				
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
1. The programs require re- cruiters to take a great deal of time out of their regular duties to train and supervise participants.	25	41	9	10	15	24	45	9	10	12	13	37	25	13	11
2. Generally speaking, pro- gram participants have no impact on the morale of the station.	15	20	28	18	19	16	19	32	16	17	16	18	37	12	17
3. Program participants do <u>not</u> increase the station's recruiting effectiveness.	3	10	13	36	38	7	16	17	39	22	9	13	24	30	24
4. Participants directly help the station reach its goal by bringing in good pros- pects and creating acces- sions.	36	39	16	7	3	14	45	21	14	6	13	28	33	17	10
5. Participants help the sta- tion indirectly by setting up centers of influence which later lead to pros- pects and accessions.	24	40	20	9	7	16	39	23	14	9	26	29	29	10	6

SECTION 6 - MORE SURVEY QUESTIONS

1. Forgetting for a moment the rules regarding selection for RAP and HARP, what is the best time in a person's Navy career to participate in recruiter assistance programs?

Percent Responding

<u>26</u>	a. Immediately after boot camp
<u>56</u>	b. Immediately after A school
<u>13</u>	c. One-two years after joining the Navy
<u>3</u>	d. Three-five years after joining the Navy
<u>1</u>	e. More than five years after joining the Navy

2. How useful are the recruiter assistance programs for identifying persons with potential to be good recruiters in the future?

<u>32</u>	a. Very useful
<u>42</u>	b. Somewhat useful
<u>16</u>	c. Slightly useful
<u>10</u>	d. Not useful

SECTION 7 - QUESTIONS ABOUT RAP

Percent Responding

<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>	
18	82	They tend to be too immature to handle the assignment and to assist the recruiting effort.
95	5	Having just finished boot camp or A school, RAPs tend to be fired-up about the Navy.
8	92	RAPs coming right out of boot camp tend to be down on the experience and express a bad attitude toward the Navy.

2. How much control do you have in getting the RAP participants you want?

Percent Responding

<u>5</u>	a. A lot
<u>14</u>	b. Considerable
<u>29</u>	c. Some, but should be more
<u>34</u>	d. Very little
<u>19</u>	e. None

3. Some persons familiar with RAP have suggested that Company Commanders at RTC should nominate for RAP duty boot camp graduates who appear especially fired-up about the Navy and are likely to make a good impression on prospects. What do you think of this idea?

Percent Responding

27
44
29

- a. Very good idea; should be put into operation.
- b. Good idea; it's worth a try.
- c. Not a good idea; Company Commanders don't know enough about the contacts a boot camp graduate may or may not have in his/her community.

4. How often are recruiting stations given enough time to prepare for a RAP participant before his/her arrival?

6
25
32
31
6

- a. Always
- b. Usually
- c. Sometimes
- d. Rarely
- e. Never

5. Which statement best describes your feelings about how RAP participants are selected for duty? The process is:

2
55
37
7

- a. Very effective; RAP participants are always well-qualified to serve in the program.
- b. Somewhat effective; many participants chosen are qualified and capable.
- c. Somewhat ineffective; many persons who are selected cannot handle the duties.
- d. Very ineffective; anyone who really wants to participate in the program is accepted even if they are not well-qualified.

6. Overall, how successful is the RAP program in meeting its mission?

1
20
63
16
—

- a. Extremely successful
- b. Very successful
- c. Somewhat successful
- d. Unsuccessful for the most part
- e. Completely unsuccessful

SECTION 8 - QUESTIONS ABOUT HARP

1. In your opinion why do most people volunteer for HARP?

Percent Responding

78
1

- a. To get a vacation near home
b. To see what recruiting has to offer (as a possible future assignment)

2
19

- c. To help in the recruiting effort
d. To get away from their fleet job for awhile

2. What do you think of this suggestion? HARP requirements should be more strictly followed in assigning personnel to HARP duty (e.g., relatively young, HS graduate, etc.).

87
13

- a. Agree
b. Disagree

3. Overall, how successful is the HARP program in meeting its mission?

1
5
49
39
7

- a. Extremely successful
b. Very successful
c. Somewhat successful
d. Unsuccessful for the most part
e. Completely unsuccessful

SECTION 9 - QUESTIONS ABOUT SEMINAR

1. In your experience, to what extent have SEMINAR participants been successful in raising minority community awareness of the NAVY?

Percent Responding

5
57
38

- a. Very successful
b. Somewhat successful
c. Not successful

2. What do you see as the most effective role for SEMINAR participants?

31
27
42

- a. Prospecting for minority recruits
b. Working directly with minority persons already identified as prospects
c. Giving presentations about the Navy in person and on TV/radio

3. Overall, how successful is the SEMINAR program in meeting its mission?

1
6
53
25
16

- a. Extremely successful
b. Very successful
c. Somewhat successful
d. Unsuccessful for the most part
e. Completely unsuccessful

Open-Ended Questions

Section 1 - Item 12: How else might these programs be improved?

Number and Percent Responding

RAP (N=97)		HARP (N=107)		SEMINAR (N=23)	
N	%	N	%	N	%
28	29% ¹	32	29%		

24 86%² 27 84%

3 10% 3 9%

1 5% 1 3%

1 3%

20	21%	24	22%	6	26%
----	-----	----	-----	---	-----

14 70% 3 12.5% 1 16%

1. Instruct or inform program participants about program requirements before they begin duty.

Tell participants what will be expected of them before they are sent to the recruiting station. For example:
uniforms required, general appearance requirements; brief participants on the consequences of failing or performing ineffectively and provide written evaluations of participants that go into permanent files.

Provide indoctrination or training programs covering (1) duties and responsibilities, (2) basic phone and PDC techniques, and (3) incentives and awards.

Provide a program manual to allow potential participants to review requirements and duties before applying.

Ensure orders are explicit about start dates for duty and for leave.

2. Screen applicants more thoroughly and allow more recruiter input into selection decisions.

Rely more heavily on recruiters' recommendations for selecting participants; send only those the recruiter has requested.

¹These values reflect the number of respondents and the percentage of respondents providing comments related to the major content area (e.g., 28 of 97 respondents or 29 percent of the respondents provided comments or suggestions regarding category 1).

²These values represent the number of responses and the percentage of responses related to each subcategory within each major content area (e.g., 24 of 28 responses or 86 percent of the responses were related to the first subcategory).

Number and Percent
Responding

RAP (N=97)	HARP (N=107)	SEMINAR (N=23)
6 30%	21 87.5%	5 83%

10 10%	19 18%	2 9%
--------	--------	------

2 20%	2 22%
-------	-------

1 10%	1 11%
-------	-------

1 11%

1 11%

1 11%

2 22%

3 30%

2 20%

1 10%

1 11%

1 10%

1 11%

3 33%

2 22%

4 44%

1 50%

1 50%

Screen applicants more closely--the Parent Command, CO or CPO in charge should conduct personal interviews with each applicant before sending the person on duty (e.g., interview applicants to determine attitudes toward the Navy or to determine centers of influence in applicant's hometown).

3. Suggested qualities or characteristics on which selection standards should be based.

Participants should:

Be outgoing and extroverted, not shy

Be from the immediate area

Be highly motivated

Be able to communicate effectively

Meet physical appearance standards

Have less than 12 years Navy experience

Be selected directly after boot camp

Be selected directly after completing A school

Be selected from NUC, AEF, and ATE schools

Be more advanced personnel

Be out of high school four years or less

Have been on active duty 18 months or less

Be pro-Navy or re-enlist

Provide own transportation

Have demonstrated ability to recruit as a member of DEP

Number and Percent
Responding

RAP (N=97)		HARP (N=107)		SEMINAR (N=23)	
13	13%	11	10%	1	4%

7 54% 6 55% 1 100%

3 23%

1 8%

1 8%

3 27%

1 8%

2 18%

8	8%	10	9%	1	4%
---	----	----	----	---	----

2 25%

7 70%

4. After the length of duty or assignment, provide options for extending duty and provide incentives for increasing production.

Provide incentives for outstanding performance, e.g., awards, commendations, extra money for a specified number of accessions or lengthen tour of duty for a specified number of accessions or referrals.

Shorten initial length of assignment or duty so that assignments can be extended for effective participants only.

Allow station personnel to terminate participants after the first week if they fail to perform effectively.

Reduce program length during the summer months.

Assign specific production goals to program participants.

Lengthen tour of duty (e.g., for HARPs and for 4 YO's and 6 YO's).

5. Provide more information about which applicants are selected.

Ensure the zone supervisor and RINC are notified and are permitted the "last word" for approval of selected participants (e.g., the RINC should speak directly with each applicant).

Number and Percent
Responding

RAP (N=97)	HARP (N=107)	SEMINAR (N=23)
---------------	-----------------	-------------------

1 12.5%

Participants should check in with the zone supervisor.

2 25%

1 10%

1 100%

Provide more lead time, e.g., notify the NRD 30 days in advance of TAD orders.

2 25%

Provide notice of approval or disapproval of all program nominees and/or provide some type of follow-up.

1 12.5%

2 30%

Provide more information about the selected program participant, e.g., name of hometown and distance from the recruiting station and list high school attend

9 9%

- -

3 13%

6. Provide more program participants to stations and zones.

5 55%

3 100%

Send more participants.

1 11%

Send more participants during January through May.

2 22%

Ensure program participants are available to all stations or zones that request them.

1 11%

Provide more program funds to increase the number of participants.

6 6%

4 4%

- -

7. Allow program participants to drive government vehicles provided they have government driver's license.

3 3%

7 7%

10 43%

8. Miscellaneous

1 33%

1 10%

Provide training for recruiters to effectively utilize program participants.

1 33%

1 14%

Arrange for hometown news release prior to program participant's arrival.

Number and Percent
Responding

<u>RAP</u> <u>(N=97)</u>	<u>HARP</u> <u>(N=107)</u>	<u>SEMINAR</u> <u>(N=23)</u>	
		1 10%	Use the program to assess participants' potential as recruiters
		1 10%	Use participants more in high schools
		1 10%	Most participants are looking for time off
	5 71%	5 50%	Eliminate the program
1 33%	1 14%	1 10%	This is a good program

Section 2 - Item 12: Other Problems with the Programs

RAP (N=37)		HARP (N=58)		SEMINAR (N=8)	
N	%	N	%	N	%
16	43%	27	43%	3	38%
12	75%	22	81%	1	33%
2	12.5%	3	11%	1	33%
1	6%	1	4%		
1	6%	1	4%		
				1	33%
15	41%	24	38%	1	13%

3 12.5%

1 6%

4 26%

13 54%

1 6%

7 47%

6 25%

1. Problems with program participants.

Do not understand the program mission or what is expected of them while on duty (e.g., believe duty is a free vacation).

Report without the proper military uniforms, haircuts, etc.

May experience personal problems (e.g., financial).

Have little experience with recruiting duty and the fluctuating work hours.

Participants may not be highly motivated to perform well

2. Problems with selection and placement of program participants.

The program should not be used as an incentive for re-enlistment.

Participants should demonstrate some ability to recruit (e.g., provide contacts or accessions as a new recruit or DEP).

Requirements are not strictly adhered to.

Improper or insufficient screening procedures are used, e.g., participants may have negative attitudes toward the Navy or may not have any contacts in the hometown.

The program should not be restricted to upper CAT level groups.

Participant may not be from the immediate area, thus transportation is a problem.

Number and Percent
Responding

RAP (N=37)	HARP (N=58)	SEMINAR (N=8)
---------------	----------------	------------------

2 8%

2 13%

1 100%

1 3%	5 8%	- -
------	------	-----

1 100%

1 20%

4 80%

2 5%	3 5%	2 25%
------	------	-------

1 50%

1 50%

3 100% 2 100%

2 5%	2 3%	- -
------	------	-----

2 100%

1 50%

1 50%

1 3%	1 1.5%	1 13%
------	--------	-------

1 100%

Too many participants are sent during the holidays and too few during the summer months.

Too few participants are sent

3. Length of program

It is difficult to extend assignments for effective participants; tour of duty should be extended for those who gain accessions or provide many prospects.

Program is too short when combined with leave.

4. Program funding or payment

Participants do not understand the pay schedule (e.g., RAPs receive money in advance and if they are terminated early, they must return the money).

Money should not be advanced.

Lack of funding or incentives.

5. Lack of effective communication with the stations.

Should notify stations in advance to obtain final approval and provide more information about the participant.

Participants refused by recruiters should not be sent.

6. Problems with recruiters.

Recruiters fail to properly utilize program participants.

Number and Percent
Responding

<u>RAP</u> <u>(N=37)</u>	<u>HARP</u> <u>(N=58)</u>	<u>SEMINAR</u> <u>(N=8)</u>
1	100%	1 100%
1	1.5%	1 13%
1	100%	1 100%

Recruiters may fail to properly brief applicants before recommending them to program duty.

7. Miscellaneous

There are no problems.

Section 3 - Item 5: Other Reasons Why a Participant
Was Not Successful

Respondents often failed to indicate the program to which the response was directed. Thus, responses to this item are collapsed across the programs.

Percent and Number
Responding
(N = 28)

N %
9 32%

Problems with program participants. A participant failed to understand the program mission or thought the assignment was a vacation.

3 11%

Lived too far away and lacked transportation.

2 7%

Lacked motivation.

1 4%

Lacked specific knowledge about the Navy.

1 4%

Developed personal problems while on duty.

5 18%

The recruiter failed to explain the program, to assign goals, or to provide adequate supervision.

2 7%

The parent command failed to inform the participant about program requirements.

7 25%

Other respondents indicated that the participant's lack of success was due to a combination of the alternatives provided.

Section 3 - Item 6: Other Roles of Program Participants.

Respondents in general suggested other roles that are very similar to those listed in Item 5. For example, "provide quality referrals" is very similar to alternative (d) "bring in accessions or quality prospects." Other respondents indicated that participants had a combination of roles and that one was no more important than the other.

Section 4: Other Roles in Which Respondents Are Useful

Much like the previous item, respondents described additional roles of participants that are very similar to those listed on that page. One role not listed as an alternative on that page, but suggested by one of the respondents is:

Provide ready access to latest information about the fleet, boot camp, 'A' school training.

No open-ended items in Sections 5 and 6.

Sections 7, 8 and 9: What Aspects of the Program Have Been
Most Important for Its Success? (Items 7-7, 8-4, and 9-4)

Number and Percent
Responding

RAP (N= 125)		HARP (N=121)		SEMINAR (N=46)	
N	%	N	%	N	%
56	45%	66	56%	10	22%
12	21%	12	18%	3	30%
		3	4%		
1	2%	5	8%	1	10%
10	18%	8	12%	1	10%
6	11%	19	29%	1	10%
		3	4%	2	20%
1	2%	1	2%		
5	9%				
7	13%				
1	2%				
13	23%				

1. Screening and selection procedures.

Screening and selection procedures when followed provide high quality personnel.

Qualities and other characteristics viewed as important for program success:

Participants that have been successful in the past on providing referrals (e.g., DEPs or former RAPs).

Have positive attitudes toward the Navy.

Are highly motivated.

Are knowledgeable about the Navy.

Are mature.

Are from NUC/AEF/ATE schools.

Comments specific to each program

Send directly following 'A' school.

RAPS

Send immediately after boot camp

Those who demonstrate leadership are generally successful.

Are requested or selected by recruiter.

Number and Percent
Responding

RAP
(N=125)

HARP
(N=121)

SEMINAR
(N=46)

9 13%

5 8%

1 2%

1 10%

1 10%

41 33%	21 17%	23 50%
--------	--------	--------

20 49% 18 86% 6 26%

4 10% 1 4% 5 22%

5 12%

3 7%

9 22% 2 10% 7 30%

5 22%

16 13%	13 11%	4 9%
--------	--------	------

3 19% 10 77%

12 75% 3 23% 4 100%

1 6%

HARPS

Are young with approximately 18 months of experience--definitely less than four years experience in the Navy.

Those considering recruiting duty are usually effective.

Represent the top 10 percent in the Navy.

Have many local contacts

Can make presentations to large groups

2. Participant input adds to the success of the program.

Can generate referrals from people he/she knows (e.g., renews contacts with friends and peers, makes an impact on the peer group showing how Navy life has benefited him/her).

Establishes community relations and creates a community awareness of the Navy.

Brings in referrals and gains accessions.

Describes recent boot camp and school experiences to potential prospects.

Identifies with prospects his/her own age and provides a role model to younger community members.

Help the recruiter gain entry into the minority community.

3. Recruiter input adds to the success of the program. The program is more effective when:

The recruiter provides proper supervision and guidance.

The recruiter is involved with the participant (e.g., recruiters establish goals for participants).

The recruiter understands the program mission

Number and Percent
Responding

RAP (N=125)		HARP (N=121)		SEMINAR (N=46)	
3	2%	8	7%	-	-

3	2%	11	9%	7	15%
---	----	----	----	---	-----

6 5% 2 2% 2 4%

4 3%

2 1.5%

1 1%

1 1%

1 50%

1 50%

Sections 7, 8, and 9: What Aspects Have Been Most Important for Reducing
Its Effectiveness? (Items 7-8, 8-5 and 9-5)

Number and Percent
Responding

RAP (N= 135)		HARP (N=148)		SEMINAR (N=57)	
56	41%	75	51%	15	26%

10 18% 20 27%

8 14% 27 36% 7 47%

4. The program is more successful when the program requirements are described or discussed with participants before they apply or before they are sent on duty.

5. The program has not proven successful; it should be dropped; or it is not cost effective.

6. Miscellaneous comments specific to each program:

RAP

The length of the program--30 days is a good time frame.

Incentives are provided (e.g., per diem and extension incentives).

HARP

Participants who provide their own transportation are more effective.

Need longer assignments or tours of duty.

SEMINAR

Program participants do help recruiters gain access to the minority community but when they leave the barrier between the NRS and minority community returns.

Most participants are too old and lack transportation

1. Selection and screening problems

Parent command or fleet may use this assignment as a reward or bonus.

Parent command does not understand the program mission; may fail to follow selection criteria (e.g., anyone who requests this duty gets it).

Number and Percent
Responding

RAP (N= 135)		HARP (N=148)		SEMINAR (N=57)		
13	23%			-	-	Do not always use recruiter input to select participants.
25	45%	28	37%	8	53%	Fail to select for highly motivated participants who have positive attitudes toward the Navy, demonstrate the required military appearance, are knowledgeable about the Navy and have many contacts in their hometown.
21	16%	14	9%	9	16%	2. Problems with individual participants
21	100%	3	21%	9	100%	
		11	79%			Unwilling to work with recruiters or perform duties because they do not understand the program mission.
41	30%	55	37%	26	46%	Looking for a vacation rather than work.
		22	40%	-	-	3. Problems with program implementation.
2	5%	5	9%	5	19%	
7	17%	1	2%	4	15%	Participants are not given any training or instruction before they are sent on duty.
6	15%	7	13%	-	-	No incentives for effective performance are provided.
5	12%	12	22%	1	4%	The station is not notified in advance or too little lead time is given before participant arrives.
5	12%	1	2%	2	8%	Participant assignments need to be more carefully made (e.g., participants may live too far away).
13	32%	4	7%	-	-	Program is too short.
3	7%	3	5%	14	54%	Lack of funds or funds are unevenly distributed among participants.
						There is no plan for handling transportation problems if participant does not have his/her own vehicle.
						Too few participants are available.

Number and Percent
Responding

RAP (N=135)		HARP (N=148)		SEMINAR (N=57)	
17	13%	4	3%	1	2%
12	70%	4	100%	1	100%
5	30%				

4. Problems with recruiters in charge.

Recruiters fail to supervise participant effectively.

Recruiter may misuse participant (e.g., assign participant only paperwork tasks)

Last Section: "Finally, we ask you to provide suggestions for making more effective any one or all of the recruiter assistance programs."

All comments, whether directed toward the RAP, HARP, SEMINAR, or all three programs, were reviewed and, if possible, categorized into groups that cut across all programs. If, however, a comment was directed specifically toward one program, that comment was not placed into one of the broad groupings. Instead it was placed into a section labeled "Comments Specific to One Program".

Some additional statements about Section 1: As with the previous category systems, Section 1 contains comments or suggestions directed toward the three programs. These comments have been categorized into broad groupings and are listed by frequency with which the comments appeared. Finally, we also provide a count of the number of times the groups of comments were made for (1) RAP, (2) HARP, (3) SEMINAR,³ (4) all three combined, and (5) the total number (N) and the number of respondents providing comments in each category (K).

³Very few recruiters provided comments or suggestions for the SEMINAR program alone. Instead comments were directed toward all three programs. Thus comments or suggestions for improving the SEMINAR program are often grouped in the ALL three combined category.

The total number of respondents providing comments in this last section is 109, whereas the total number of comments provided is 256.

Thus, those providing comments, suggestions, opinions, etc. generally provided more than one.

1. Improve Selection System.

Strict screening to determine motivation, attitude toward the Navy, maturity, self-confidence, public speaking ability and military bearing.

Provide or use input from local recruiters, RTC company commanders or instructors, and command career counselors.

Use DEP referrals as a selection criterion.

Give more guidance to the fleet in selection of participants.

N = 57	RAP = 14	HARP = 15	All = 28	22% ⁴
k = 49				45% ⁵

⁴ This value represents the percentage of the total number of comments appearing in each category (N=256).

⁵ This value indicates the proportion of respondents providing comments in each category (N=109).

2. Specific criteria for selection

- . Select personnel in 6 YO programs (e.g., NUC, AEF)
- . Select ATP grads or personnel in 4 YO programs
- . Graduate status has no bearing on success
- . Select high school grads
- . Permit only 2nd and 3rd class P. O.
- . Well-groomed and highly motivated
- . Select CAT IIIs rather than CAT Is and IIs
- . Have no class standing prerequisites (possibly upper

75%)

N = 9

RAP = 4

HARP = 3

All = 2

4%

K = 6

6%⁵

3. Thoroughly brief participants on duties and responsibilities prior to assignment.

- Briefing should include a discussion of goals, hours, transportation, attitude, appearance, and motivation.
- Develop an information booklet for commanding officers, fleet personnel, recruiters, and participants.
- Conduct a briefing interview with each participant; interviews may be conducted by command career counselor, CO, XO, instructors or local recruiter (by phone).
- Provide each participant with various training materials prior to assignment.

N = 38	RAP = 3	HARP = 8	All = 27	15% ⁴
K = 28				26% ⁵

4. Provide incentives for outstanding performance in recruiter assistance programs.

Incentives may include: advancement to next pay grade, extension of recruiter assistance duty, Navy Achievement Medal nomination, special library Letter of Appreciation, bonuses, second tour.

- . Provide for early termination for poor performance.
- . Establish an evaluation system which would become part of participant's permanent record.

N = 27 RAP = 3 HARP = 5 SEMINAR = 1 All = 18 10%⁴
 K = 21 19%⁵

- . Contradiction⁶ - Do not use incentives; the participant should have a positive attitude and desire to sell the Navy.

5. Give the local recruiter/zone supervisor more input into the selection decision.

- . Give local recruiter "final say" in selecting participants.
- . Do not assign participants without prior approval from local recruiter.
- . Allow the local recruiter to screen all applicants.
- . Assign only those persons nominated by their recruiter; they know who they want.

⁶ The contradiction statements represent comments made by one or two respondents that reflect a viewpoint opposing that stated in the major category statement. These statements were added to indicate that even though a great many respondents shared an opinion, one or two other respondents held a contradictory opinion.

- Honor any recruiter requests for personnel; instructors should not recommend RAP duty, recruiters.

N = 23 RAP = 12 HARP = 2 All = 9 9%⁴

K = 23 21%⁵

- Contradiction⁶-Give the recruit company commander more say in who receives RAP duty; less input from recruiters.

6. Address the transportation issue.

- Insure participants have their own transportation.
- Authorize participants to use government vehicles.
- Insure that participants have a valid state driver's license.
- Insure that participants live relatively close to NRS.

N = 18 RAP = 6 HARP = 2 All = 10 7%⁴

K = 17 16%⁵

- 7. Improve communication with NRS/NRD zone supervisors.

- Provide 30 days advance notice of assignment.
- Provide background information on participants.
- Notify promptly if participant is cancelled.
- Have participant forward referrals prior to assignment.

N = 14 RAP = 2 HARP = 2 All = 10 5%⁴
 K = 13 12%⁵

8. Assign participants to an area in which they are well known.

- Assign to "hometown".
- Assign to area where parents still reside.
- Assign to area where participants attended school.
- Select relatively recent high school graduates.
- Screen participants for specific contacts which can help recruiters.

N = 12 RAP = 3 HARP = 7 All = 4 5%⁴
 K = 12 11%⁵

9. Insure participants have a full set of uniforms prior to assignment.

N = 5 RAP = 1 HARP = 1 All = 3 2%⁴

K = 5 5%⁵

10. Lengthen duty.

N = 4 RAP = 1 HARP = 1 All = 2 2%⁴

K = 4 4%⁵

11. General comments-All programs

Discontinue.

Continue at all costs.

Include all personnel (GE-5 and above) who are considering orders to recruiting duty.

N = 3 1%⁴

K = 3 3%⁵

General Comments Geared Toward Specific Programs

1. General Comments - RAP

- . Decrease participation
- . Increase participation
- . Increase funding
- . RAP is the most beneficial program
- . Change RAP to a non-funded program (like HARP)
- . Appropriate time for RAP assignment:
 - after RTC and before 'A' school
 - after 'A' school
 - after one year in the fleet
- . RAP per diem is not justified
 - either RAPs should not draw extra money or all participants should draw extra money.
- . Pay RAP per diem in advance
- . Counsel RAPs on money management

N = 26

10%⁴

K = 20

18%⁵

2. General Comments - HARP

- . Discontinue the program
- . Decrease participation
- . HARP participants produce the best results
- . Increase participation
- . Limit to potential recruiters

N = 16	6% ⁴
K = 16	15% ⁵

3. General Comments - SEMINAR

- . Discontinue
- . Increase participation
- . Increase funding

N = 10	4% ⁴
K = 10	9% ⁵

15 - Miscellaneous

- . Use instructors from 'A' school or other personnel who can discuss the many fields the Navy has to offer.
- . Lack of training and motivation from recruiters is a major problem.
- . Ensure that nominees report for RAP before they take leave.
- . Recruiter should be able to call a central location for HARP..
- . (HARP and SEMINAR) Unless the coordinators become more involved in the programs, members should check in directly at the recruiting station.
- . Many recruiters do not know how to complete a Feedback Report.
- . Feedback reports should be completed the day the member departs with a follow-up report in 45-60 days.
- . Feedback reports are needless; departing RAP/HARP could be called on a toll free number (NNRIC) giving name and SSN. A mailback will be generated from NNRIC with a mailback date.
- . Do not include female participants.

- . Do not send HARPs who are on a hardship (parents ill, wife ill, etc.)
- . Selectees should keep in touch with the RINC more; let them know what they are doing.
- . Many HARPs/RAPs are not able to meet goal of one accession/week.
- . Set up advertising well in advance.
- . Would recommend a program for prospective recruiters similar to SEMINAR so that they can be better screened by NRD/NRS.
- . Send RAPs directly to RTC.

APPENDIX C

ASSUMPTIONS AND DATA USED IN COST-BENEFIT ANALYSES

Table C-1

Data for Costs per Prospect--
Fiscal 1980 Active Forces Recruiting

Items

1. Operating and maintenance costs including:

vehicles
telephone and other communications
civilian salaries
applicant travel
recruiter training (Orlando)
equipment rental
furniture
recruiter travel

2. Advertising

3. Military salaries

4. Salary bonuses for enlistees

5. Space rental/leasing for recruiting offices

Total costs = \$156,725,209

Total number of accessions = 99,351

Using Recruiting Command marketing estimates of 5 prospects = 1
accession, total number of prospects = 496,755

But, RAPs and HARPs are responsible for generating some of these prospects.

Specifically, participant report estimates of prospects generated show averages of 5.74 prospects per RAP and 4.12 prospects per HARP. Using these estimates, RAPs were responsible for 14,350 prospects (2500 x 5.74) and HARPs were responsible for 44,702 prospects (10,850 x 4.12). Thus, RAPs and HARPs together accounted for 59,052 of the 496,755 prospects, leaving recruiters responsible for 437,703.

Accordingly, total recruiting costs ÷ 437,703 = \$358/prospect

Table C-2

Data for Cost/Prospect: RAP and HARP

RAP

<u>Costs/RAP</u>		<u>Prospects Attributable to RAPs</u>
1. 30 days RAP salary	\$1,326 ^a	Average Number of prospects/ RAP (from RAP participant reports) 5.74 (.19 per day)
2. Average RAP travel	915 ^b	
3. 46 minutes/day recruiter time to administer RAP	216 ^c	
4. One-quarter time for District RAP coordinators	84 ^d	
	\$2,541	

$$\$2,541 \div 5.74 = \$443/\text{prospect for RAP-assisted contacts}$$

HARP

<u>Costs/HARP</u>		<u>Prospects Attributable to HARPs</u>
1. 10 days HARP salary	\$570 ^a	Average number of prospects/HARP from HARP participant reports 4.12 (.41 per d
2. 43 minutes/day recruiter time to administer HARP	67 ^c	
3. One-quarter time for District HARP coordinators	19 ^d	
	\$656	

$$\$656 \div 4.12 = \$159/\text{prospect for HARP-assisted contacts}$$

RAP

For one-half the prospects, i.e.,
2.87 prospects/RAP, $\$2,541 \div 2.87 =$
\$886/prospect.

For 50% greater number of prospects,
i.e., 8.61 prospects/RAP, $\$2,541 \div$
8.61 = \$295/prospect.

HARP

For one-half the prospects, i.e.,
2.06 prospects/HARP, $\$656 \div 2.06 =$
\$318/prospect.

For 50% greater number of prospects,
i.e., 6.18 prospects/HARP, $\$656 \div$
6.18 = \$106/prospect.

FOOTNOTES

^a For RAP salary, Regular Military Compensation data were used. These data include additional dollars over gross salary to take into account tax breaks, housing allowance, etc. At the E-2 level, this figure is \$11,493. The number of working days in a year was taken to be 260. To obtain the RAP salary figure, \$11,493 was multiplied by 30/260.

HARP salary was also computed using Regular Military Compensation data, this time for E-4 (\$14,809 per year). Accordingly, the estimated costs were \$14,809 x 10/260 for each HARP.

^b NRC estimated RAP travel costs at an average of \$225 for airfare and \$23 for per diem (x30 days = \$690). HARP pays no travel or per diem expenses.

^c This estimate was based on E-6 Regular Military Compensation of \$19,489, using the 260-days-per-year to compute salary costs for the 46- (or 43-) minute day.

^d For RAP, this cost was estimated by multiplying 1/4 of the E-6 Regular Military Compensation (\$19,489) by 43 (number of districts), and then dividing by, respectively, the total number of RAPs in FY1980 (2,500) and the total number of HARPs that year (10,850).

Additional Observations on RAP and HARP Costs/Benefits

To explore further impact of RAP and HARP on the overall Navy recruiting effort, consider the number of prospects they generate compared to the total number of prospects generated within the context of the proportion of the total recruiting manpower RAP and HARP represent.

From previous calculations: 59,052 prospects (RAP and HARP) generated

$59,052 \div 496,755$ (total prospects generated) = 11.89% of prospects

RAP

$2,500 \div 12 = 208$ (RAPs
rotate every 30 days)

HARP

$10,850 \div 36 = 301$ (HARPs
rotate every 10 days)

$509 \div 3,000$ (approximate number of recruiters in field) = 16.97%

In other words, about 17 percent of the recruiter force (RAPs and HARPs) generated about 12 percent of the total number of prospects according to this analysis. This appears to be quite reasonable productivity given that RAPs and HARPs are not trained recruiters.

All the cost-benefit analyses on RAP and HARP use recruiter estimates of the number of new contacts made by the program participants, and these estimates could well be inaccurate.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Chief of Naval Operations (OP-01B7) (2), (OP-135C4), (OP-140F2), (OP-987H)
Chief of Naval Material (NMAT 0722)
Chief of Naval Research (Code 270), (Code 440) (3), (Code 442), (Code 442PT)
Chief of Naval Education and Training (OOA), (N-21)
Chief of Naval Technical Training (016), (N-6)
Commandant of the Marine Corps (MPI-20)
Commander Naval Military Personnel Command (NMPC-013C)
Commander Navy Recruiting Command (Code 20)
Commanding Officer, Naval Aerospace Medical Institute (Library Code 12) (2)
Commanding Officer, Naval Technical Training Center, Corry Station (Code 101B)
Commanding Officer, Naval Training Equipment Center (Technical Library) (5), (Code N-1)
Director, Office of Naval Research Branch Office, Chicago (Coordinator for Psychological Sciences)
Commander, Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Alexandria (PERI-ASL), (PERI-ZT), (PERI-SZ)
Commander, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Brooks Air Force Base (Manpower and Personnel Division), (Scientific and Technical Information Office)
Commander, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Williams Air Force Base (AFHRL/OT)
Commander, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (AFHRL/LR)
Commanding Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Research and Development Center, Avery Point
Institute for Defense Analyses, Science and Technology Division
Defense Technical Information Center (DDA) (12)